REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 28, 2011, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing Amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-16, 18-28, and 30-47 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-16, 18-28, and 30-47 stand rejected.

The rejections of Claims 1-15, 18-27, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are respectfully traversed. In particular, Claim 1 has been amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdraw of the rejections of Claims 1-15, 18-27, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The rejections of Claims 1-15, 18-27, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully traversed. In particular, Claims 1, 16, and 45 have been amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdraw of the rejection of Claims 1-15, 18-27, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The objection to Claim 1 is respectfully traversed. In particular, Claim 1 has been amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdraw of the objection to Claim 1.

The rejection of Claims 1, 14-16, 34-39, and 41-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,884,173 to Gauselmann (hereinafter referred to as "Gauselmann") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0219962 to Vancura (hereinafter referred to as "Vancura") is respectfully traversed.

Gauselmann describes a configuration technique for a gaming machine (10) that is coupled to a configuration server (60) and a plurality of operator interfaces (58, 59) via a network. An initial configuration must be completed by a casino attendant, including opening a front door of the gaming machine (10) and setting the gaming machine (10) to a configuration mode. The casino attendant enters the configuration of the gaming machine

(10) using a touch screen (12). For example, the casino attendant selects one of a plurality of games to be presented by the gaming machine (10), and game parameters including whether the game type is a free game type or a credit version, acceptable denominations of coins or bills that will be accepted by the gaming machine (10), a number of video reels to display, a number of paylines to display, bet amounts that may be made on each payline, an average payout percentage, currency exchange rates, and sound levels. When the casino attendant has completed the initial configuration, the gaming machine (10) uploads the configuration to the configuration server (60) for storage. Thereafter, the casino attendant uses the operator interfaces (58, 59) to specify which gaming machines (10) are to use which stored configurations. The specified gaming machines (10) download the configuration from the configuration server (60) and apply the parameters accordingly. Gauselmann further describes that all the initial settings may, instead, be directly defined via an operator's console without the operator being physically present at any EGM. Notably, as acknowledged by the Examiner on page 9 of the Office Action, Gauselmann does not describe nor suggest a method including detecting a selected triggering criterion, receiving player data, wherein player data includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining one or more of the selected triggering criterion that correspond to the player data, and triggering an operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more of the selected triggering criterion corresponds to.

Vancura describes a method of enabling a player to customize a casino game. Before playing a base game, the player is offered the choice of a plurality of aspects of bonus play from which to pre-select at the gaming machine. The player may choose trigger symbols that signify entry to bonus play. Moreover, the player may choose a type of bonus game to play at the gaming machine, should the player qualify. Further, the player may choose a monetary value and/or a difficulty of the bonus game played at the gaming machine. That is, in contrast to the present claims, Vancura requires *a player* (not an operator) to choose aspects of a bonus game *at the gaming machine*, prior to starting play of a base game. Thus, not only is the selection made by a player, not an operator, the selection is made at the gaming machine and not at a location remote from the gaming machine as recited in the present

claims. Notably, Vancura does not describe nor suggest a method including receiving, from a location remote from networked gaming machines, a selection from an operator of the networked gaming machines at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria displayed in a list to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of a base game and the bonus game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game and is specific to a particular player playing the base game. Further, Vancura does not describe nor suggest detecting a selected triggering criterion, receiving player data, wherein player data includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining one or more of the selected triggering criterion that correspond to the player data, and triggering an operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more of the selected triggering criterion corresponds to.

Further, MPEP 2141.02 VI requires that prior art references must be considered in their entirety. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). In the present rejection, it is evident that the Office is improperly picking and choosing various elements of the prior art in hindsight, and ignoring to how the elements in the prior art would interact if combined.

For example, while the Office relies on Gauselmann as allegedly describing that all the initial settings may, instead, be directly defined via an operator's console without the operator being physically present at any EGM. The Office acknowledges that Gauselmann does not describe nor suggest a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player. As such, the Office provides an additional reference, Vancura, that requires *a player* (not an operator) to choose aspects of a bonus game *at the gaming machine*, prior to starting play of a base game, which is the exact opposite of what the Office is relying on Gauselmann for (e.g., an operator, not a player, defining bonus settings remote from the gaming device). Therefore, Vancura actually teaches away from defining initial settings via an operator's console without an operator being physically present at any EGM. Thus, as the Court indicated in *U.S. v. Adams*, "[i]f art 'teaches away' from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the non-obviousness of the invention." U.S. v.

<u>Adams</u>, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); <u>Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.</u>, 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Further, even if Vancura described a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player, the combination of Gauselmann and Vancura would still fail to describe or suggest receiving, from a location remote from networked gaming machines, a selection from an operator of the networked gaming machines at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria displayed in a list to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of a base game and the bonus game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game and is specific to a particular player playing the base game.

Claim 1 recites a method for an operator of networked gaming machines to remotely configure a bonus game on at least one of the networked gaming machines, wherein at least some of the gaming machines are of a type having a base game display area and a bonus game display area, and wherein the method comprises "receiving, from a location remote from the networked gaming machines, a selection from the operator of the networked gaming machines at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria displayed in a list to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of a base game and the bonus game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game and is specific to a particular player playing the base game . . . detecting, via a processor, the selected triggering criterion; receiving player data that includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity; determining, via a processor, one or more of the selected triggering criterion that correspond to the player data; triggering the operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more of the selected triggering criterion corresponds to ...."

No combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests a method for an operator of networked gaming machines to remotely configure a bonus game, as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, no combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor

suggests a method including receiving, from a location remote from networked gaming machines, a selection from an operator of the networked gaming machines at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria displayed in a list to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of a base game and the bonus game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game and is specific to a particular player playing the base game. Further, no combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests detecting, via processor, a selected triggering criterion, receiving player data, wherein player data includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining, via a processor, one or more of the selected triggering criterion that correspond to the player data, and triggering an operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more of the selected triggering criterion corresponds to.

Rather, MPEP 2141.02 VI requires that prior art references must be considered in their entirety. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). In the present rejection, it is evident that the Office is improperly picking and choosing various elements of the prior art in hindsight, and ignoring to how the elements in the prior art would interact if combined.

For example, while the Office relies on Gauselmann as allegedly describing that all the initial settings may, instead, be directly defined via an operator's console without the operator being physically present at any EGM. The Office acknowledges that Gauselmann does not describe nor suggest a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player. As such, the Office provides an additional reference, Vancura, that requires *a player* (not an operator) to choose aspects of a bonus game *at the gaming machine*, prior to starting play of a base game, which is the exact opposite of what the Office is relying on Gauselmann for (e.g., an operator, not a player, defining bonus settings remote from the gaming device). Therefore, Vancura actually teaches away from defining initial settings via an operator's console without an operator being physically present at any EGM. Thus, as the Court indicated in *U.S. v. Adams*, "[i]f art 'teaches away' from a

claimed invention, such a teaching supports the non-obviousness of the invention." U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Further, even if Vancura described a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player, the combination of Gauselmann and Vancura would still fail to describe or suggest receiving, from a location remote from networked gaming machines, a selection from an operator of the networked gaming machines at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria displayed in a list to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of a base game and the bonus game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game and is specific to a particular player playing the base game.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura.

Claims 14-16 and 45 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 14-16 and 45 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 14-16 and 45 likewise are patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura.

Claim 34 recites a method for remotely configuring a gaming machine over a network from a configuration computer, wherein the method comprises "allowing one or more of the bonus promotion criteria to be selected by a network operator and causing the one or more selected criteria to be transmitted over the network to the gaming machine; receiving the one or more selected criteria at the gaming machine and configuring the gaming machine according to the selected criteria, wherein the selected bonus game triggering criteria are based at least partially on at least one selected outcome of a base game played on the gaming machine and selected using the bonus configuration program; receiving player data that includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity; determining which of the one or more selected criteria correspond to the player data; and triggering the operation

of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more selected criteria corresponds to."

No combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests a method for remotely configuring a gaming machine over a network from a configuration computer, as recited in Claim 34. More specifically, no combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests allowing one or more bonus promotion criteria to be selected by a network operator and causing the one or more selected criteria to be transmitted over a network to a gaming machine, receiving the one or more selected criteria at the gaming machine and configuring the gaming machine according to the selected criteria, wherein the selected bonus game triggering criteria are based at least partially on at least one selected outcome of a base game played on the gaming machine and selected using the bonus configuration program. Further, no combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests receiving player data that includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining which of the one or more selected criteria correspond to the player data, and triggering the operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more selected criteria corresponds to.

Rather, MPEP 2141.02 VI requires that prior art references must be considered in their entirety. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). In the present rejection, it is evident that the Office is improperly picking and choosing various elements of the prior art in hindsight, and ignoring to how the elements in the prior art would interact if combined.

For example, while the Office relies on Gauselmann as allegedly describing that all the initial settings may, instead, be directly defined via an operator's console without the operator being physically present at any EGM. The Office acknowledges that Gauselmann does not describe nor suggest a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player. As such, the Office provides an additional reference, Vancura, that requires *a player* (not an operator) to choose aspects of a bonus game *at the gaming machine*, prior to starting play of a base game, which is the exact opposite of what

the Office is relying on Gauselmann for (e.g., an operator, not a player, defining bonus settings remote from the gaming device). Therefore, Vancura actually teaches away from defining initial settings via an operator's console without an operator being physically present at any EGM. Thus, as the Court indicated in *U.S. v. Adams*, "[i]f art 'teaches away' from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the non-obviousness of the invention." U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Further, even if Vancura described a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player, the combination of Gauselmann and Vancura would still fail to describe or suggest allowing one or more bonus promotion criteria to be selected by a network operator and causing the one or more selected criteria to be transmitted over a network to a gaming machine.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 34 is submitted to be patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura.

Claims 35-39 depend from independent Claim 34. When the recitations of Claims 35-39 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 34, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 35-39 likewise are patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura.

Claim 41 recites a method for configuring a gaming machine of a type coupled to a network and having a base game and a bonus game, wherein the method comprises "selecting, by a network operator at the configuration computer, one or more of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria presented by the configuration program and specific to a particular player playing the base game at the gaming machine, said one or more selected criteria each comprising a bonus game triggering criterion associated with the gaming machine, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple pre-selected outcomes of the base game selected at the configuration computer . . . detecting the selected triggering criterion; receiving player data that includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity; determining which of the one or more selected criteria correspond to the player data; triggering the operation of the bonus game on a gaming

machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more selected criteria corresponds to...."

No combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests a method for configuring a gaming machine, as recited in Claim 41. More specifically, no combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests selecting, by a network operator at a configuration computer, one or more of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria presented by a configuration program and specific to a particular player playing a base game at a gaming machine, the one or more selected criteria each including a bonus game triggering criterion associated with the gaming machine, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple pre-selected outcomes of the base game selected at the configuration computer. Further, no combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests detecting the selected triggering criterion, receiving player data, wherein player data includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining which of the one or more selected criteria correspond to the player data, and triggering an operation of the bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more selected criteria corresponds to.

Rather, MPEP 2141.02 VI requires that prior art references must be considered in their entirety. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). In the present rejection, it is evident that the Office is improperly picking and choosing various elements of the prior art in hindsight, and ignoring to how the elements in the prior art would interact if combined.

For example, while the Office relies on Gauselmann as allegedly describing that all the initial settings may, instead, be directly defined via an operator's console without the operator being physically present at any EGM. The Office acknowledges that Gauselmann does not describe nor suggest a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player. As such, the Office provides an additional reference, Vancura, that requires *a player* (not an operator) to choose aspects of a bonus game *at the gaming machine*, prior to starting play of a base game, which is the exact opposite of what

the Office is relying on Gauselmann for (e.g., an operator, not a player, defining bonus settings remote from the gaming device). Therefore, Vancura actually teaches away from defining initial settings via an operator's console without an operator being physically present at any EGM. Thus, as the Court indicated in *U.S. v. Adams*, "[i]f art 'teaches away' from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the non-obviousness of the invention." U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Further, even if Vancura described a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player, the combination of Gauselmann and Vancura would still fail to describe or suggest selecting, by a network operator at a configuration computer, one or more of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria presented by a configuration program and specific to a particular player playing a base game at a gaming machine, the one or more selected criteria each including a bonus game triggering criterion associated with the gaming machine, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple pre-selected outcomes of the base game selected at the configuration computer.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 41 is submitted to be patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura.

Claim 42 depends from independent Claim 41. When the recitations of Claim 42 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 41, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 42 likewise is patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura.

Claim 43 recites a gaming machine coupled to a network and controlled by a processor and a memory in response to a wager, wherein the gaming machine comprises a special feature indicated on a visual display that depicts a bonus event triggered responsive to a bonus rule received over a network and stored in memory, and that is generated at a configuration station coupled to the network by "selecting, by a network operator, at least one of each of: a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria, wherein at least one of the plurality of selected bonus game triggering criteria is based at least partially on multiple

23

selected outcomes of a based game played on the gaming machine and is specific to a particular player playing a game at the gaming machine . . . at least one processor programmed to: receive player data that includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity; determine which of the plurality of bonus game triggering criteria correspond to the player data; and trigger the operation of the bonus game on the gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined bonus game triggering criteria corresponds to."

No combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests a gaming machine, as recited in Claim 43. More specifically, no combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests selecting, by a network operator a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria, wherein at least one of the plurality of selected bonus game triggering criteria is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of a based game played on a gaming machine and is specific to a particular player playing a base game at the gaming machine. Further, no combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests at least one processor programmed to receive player data, wherein player data includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determine which of the plurality of bonus game triggering criteria correspond to the player data, and trigger an operation of the bonus game on the gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined bonus game triggering criteria corresponds to.

Rather, MPEP 2141.02 VI requires that prior art references must be considered in their entirety. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). In the present rejection, it is evident that the Office is improperly picking and choosing various elements of the prior art in hindsight, and ignoring to how the elements in the prior art would interact if combined.

For example, while the Office relies on Gauselmann as allegedly describing that all the initial settings may, instead, be directly defined via an operator's console without the operator being physically present at any EGM. The Office acknowledges that Gauselmann does not describe nor suggest a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player. As such, the Office provides an additional reference,

24

Vancura, that requires *a player* (not an operator) to choose aspects of a bonus game *at the gaming machine*, prior to starting play of a base game, which is the exact opposite of what the Office is relying on Gauselmann for (e.g., an operator, not a player, defining bonus settings remote from the gaming device). Therefore, Vancura actually teaches away from defining initial settings via an operator's console without an operator being physically present at any EGM. Thus, as the Court indicated in *U.S. v. Adams*, "[i]f art 'teaches away' from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the non-obviousness of the invention." U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Further, even if Vancura described a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player, the combination of Gauselmann and Vancura would still fail to describe or suggest selecting, by a network operator a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria, wherein at least one of the plurality of selected bonus game triggering criteria is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of a based game played on a gaming machine and is specific to a particular player playing a base game at the gaming machine.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 43 is submitted to be patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura.

Claim 44 depends from independent Claim 43. When the recitations of Claim 44 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 43, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 44 likewise is patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura.

Claim 46 recites an apparatus for an operator of networked gaming machines to remotely configure a bonus game on at least one of the networked gaming machines, wherein the apparatus comprises "an input device configured to: receive, from the operator, a selection of at least one of the plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of the games, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game selected at the configuration workstation prior to play of the at least one game and

is specific to a player playing a base game at the gaming machine . . . receive player data that includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity; determine which of the at least one of the plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria corresponds to the player data; detect the selected triggering criterion; trigger the operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined possible bonus game triggering criteria corresponds to...."

No combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests an apparatus, as recited in Claim 46. More specifically, no combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests an input device configured to receive, from an operator, a selection of at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of a base game selected at a configuration workstation prior to play of the at least one game and is specific to a player playing a base game at a gaming machine. Further, no combination of Gauselmann and Vancura describes nor suggests receiving player data, wherein player data includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining which of the at least one of the plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria corresponds to the player data, detecting the selected triggering criterion, and triggering an operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined possible bonus game triggering criteria corresponds to.

Rather, MPEP 2141.02 VI requires that prior art references must be considered in their entirety. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). In the present rejection, it is evident that the Office is improperly picking and choosing various elements of the prior art in hindsight, and ignoring to how the elements in the prior art would interact if combined.

For example, while the Office relies on Gauselmann as allegedly describing that all the initial settings may, instead, be directly defined via an operator's console without the operator being physically present at any EGM. The Office acknowledges that Gauselmann does not describe nor suggest a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player

data associated with the player. As such, the Office provides an additional reference, Vancura, that requires *a player* (not an operator) to choose aspects of a bonus game *at the gaming machine*, prior to starting play of a base game, which is the exact opposite of what the Office is relying on Gauselmann for (e.g., an operator, not a player, defining bonus settings remote from the gaming device). Therefore, Vancura actually teaches away from defining initial settings via an operator's console without an operator being physically present at any EGM. Thus, as the Court indicated in *U.S. v. Adams*, "[i]f art 'teaches away' from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the non-obviousness of the invention." U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Further, even if Vancura described a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player, the combination of Gauselmann and Vancura would still fail to describe or suggest an input device configured to receive, from an operator, a selection of at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of a base game selected at a configuration workstation prior to play of the at least one game and is specific to a player playing a base game at a gaming machine.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 46 is submitted to be patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1, 14-16, 34-39, and 41-46 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 2-13, 30-33, 40, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,257,981 to Acres, et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Acres '981") is respectfully traversed.

Gauselmann and Vancura are described above. Acres '981 describes a system (10) for use in monitoring and configuring gaming devices (12-16; 22-26) connected by a

network. The system (10) includes a file server (32), a plurality of floor controllers (18; 28), and a plurality of pit terminals (34). The file server (32) stores gaming activity occurring on each gaming device (12-16; 22-26). Each pit terminal (34) monitors gaming device activity in an associated pit and is also used as a security monitoring device to detect unanticipated events such as fills or payouts. Each of the interconnected gaming devices (12-16; 22-26) includes an electronic module (40) that enables the gaming device (12-16; 22-26) to communicate with a floor controller (18; 28). The electronic module (40) includes a player tracking module (44) that includes a card reader (100) for detecting a player tracking card inserted by a player for identifying the player. The electronic module (40) also includes a data communication node (42) that communicates with the floor controller (18; 28). Each floor controller (18; 28) monitors an activity level of gaming devices (12-16; 22-26) connected to the floor controller (18; 28). The floor controllers (18; 28) also issue commands to associated gaming devices (12-16; 22-26) to reconfigure their payout schedules during certain bonusing events.

No combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '981 describes nor suggests a method for an operator of networked gaming machines to remotely configure a bonus game, as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '981 describes nor suggests a method including receiving, from a location remote from networked gaming machines, a selection from an operator of the networked gaming machines at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria displayed in a list to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of a base game and the bonus game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game and is specific to a particular player playing the base game. Further, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '981 describes nor suggests detecting, via a processor, a selected triggering criterion, receiving player data, wherein player data includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining, via a processor, one or more of the selected triggering criterion that correspond to the player data, and triggering an operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more of the selected triggering criterion corresponds to.

28

Rather, MPEP 2141.02 VI requires that prior art references must be considered in their entirety. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). In the present rejection, it is evident that the Office is improperly picking and choosing various elements of the prior art in hindsight, and ignoring to how the elements in the prior art would interact if combined.

For example, while the Office relies on Gauselmann as allegedly describing that all the initial settings may, instead, be directly defined via an operator's console without the operator being physically present at any EGM. The Office acknowledges that Gauselmann does not describe nor suggest a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player. As such, the Office provides an additional reference, Vancura, that requires *a player* (not an operator) to choose aspects of a bonus game *at the gaming machine*, prior to starting play of a base game, which is the exact opposite of what the Office is relying on Gauselmann for (e.g., an operator, not a player, defining bonus settings remote from the gaming device). Therefore, Vancura actually teaches away from defining initial settings via an operator's console without an operator being physically present at any EGM. Thus, as the Court indicated in *U.S. v. Adams*, "[i]f art 'teaches away' from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the non-obviousness of the invention." U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Further, even if Vancura described a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player, the combination of Gauselmann and Vancura would still fail to describe or suggest receiving, from a location remote from networked gaming machines, a selection from an operator of the networked gaming machines at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria displayed in a list to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of a base game and the bonus game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game and is specific to a particular player playing the base game.

In addition, Acres '981 describes a system that includes controllers and terminals, without describing any user interaction with the controllers and terminals. As such, Acres '981 does not remedy the deficiencies of Gauselmann and Vancura in describing or rendering obvious the features recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Acres '981.

Claims 2-13 and 30-33 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-13 and 30-33 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-13 and 30-33 likewise are patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Acres '981.

No combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '981 describes nor suggests a method for remotely configuring a gaming machine over a network from a configuration computer, as recited in Claim 34. More specifically, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '981 describes nor suggests allowing one or more bonus promotion criteria to be selected by a network operator and causing the one or more selected criteria to be transmitted over a network to a gaming machine, receiving the one or more selected criteria at the gaming machine and configuring the gaming machine according to the selected criteria, wherein the selected bonus game triggering criteria are based at least partially on at least one selected outcome of a base game played on the gaming machine and selected using the bonus configuration program. Further, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '981 describes nor suggests receiving player data that includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining which of the one or more selected criteria correspond to the player data, and triggering the operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more selected criteria corresponds to.

Rather, MPEP 2141.02 VI requires that prior art references must be considered in their entirety. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). In the present rejection, it is evident that

the Office is improperly picking and choosing various elements of the prior art in hindsight, and ignoring to how the elements in the prior art would interact if combined.

For example, while the Office relies on Gauselmann as allegedly describing that all the initial settings may, instead, be directly defined via an operator's console without the operator being physically present at any EGM. The Office acknowledges that Gauselmann does not describe nor suggest a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player. As such, the Office provides an additional reference, Vancura, that requires *a player* (not an operator) to choose aspects of a bonus game *at the gaming machine*, prior to starting play of a base game, which is the exact opposite of what the Office is relying on Gauselmann for (e.g., an operator, not a player, defining bonus settings remote from the gaming device). Therefore, Vancura actually teaches away from defining initial settings via an operator's console without an operator being physically present at any EGM. Thus, as the Court indicated in *U.S. v. Adams*, "[i]f art 'teaches away' from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the non-obviousness of the invention." U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Further, even if Vancura described a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player, the combination of Gauselmann and Vancura would still fail to describe or suggest allowing one or more bonus promotion criteria to be selected by a network operator and causing the one or more selected criteria to be transmitted over a network to a gaming machine.

In addition, Acres '981 describes a system that includes controllers and terminals, without describing any user interaction with the controllers and terminals. As such, Acres '981 does not remedy the deficiencies of Gauselmann and Vancura in describing or rendering obvious the features recited in Claim 34.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 34 is submitted to be patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Acres '981.

Claim 40 depends from independent Claim 34. When the recitations of Claim 40 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 34, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 40 likewise is patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Acres '981.

No combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '981 describes nor suggests an apparatus, as recited in Claim 46. More specifically, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '981 describes nor suggests an input device configured to receive, from an operator, a selection of at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of a base game selected at a configuration workstation prior to play of the at least one game and is specific to a player playing a base game at a gaming machine. Further, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '981 describes nor suggests receiving player data, wherein player data includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining which of the at least one of the plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria corresponds to the player data, detecting the selected triggering criterion, and triggering an operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined possible bonus game triggering criteria corresponds to.

Rather, MPEP 2141.02 VI requires that prior art references must be considered in their entirety. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). In the present rejection, it is evident that the Office is improperly picking and choosing various elements of the prior art in hindsight, and ignoring to how the elements in the prior art would interact if combined.

For example, while the Office relies on Gauselmann as allegedly describing that all the initial settings may, instead, be directly defined via an operator's console without the operator being physically present at any EGM. The Office acknowledges that Gauselmann

does not describe nor suggest a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player. As such, the Office provides an additional reference, Vancura, that requires *a player* (not an operator) to choose aspects of a bonus game *at the gaming machine*, prior to starting play of a base game, which is the exact opposite of what the Office is relying on Gauselmann for (e.g., an operator, not a player, defining bonus settings remote from the gaming device). Therefore, Vancura actually teaches away from defining initial settings via an operator's console without an operator being physically present at any EGM. Thus, as the Court indicated in *U.S. v. Adams*, "[i]f art 'teaches away' from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the non-obviousness of the invention." U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Further, even if Vancura described a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player, the combination of Gauselmann and Vancura would still fail to describe or suggest an input device configured to receive, from an operator, a selection of at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of a base game selected at a configuration workstation prior to play of the at least one game and is specific to a player playing a base game at a gaming machine.

In addition, Acres '981 describes a system that includes controllers and terminals, without describing any user interaction with the controllers and terminals. As such, Acres '981 does not remedy the deficiencies of Gauselmann and Vancura in describing or rendering obvious the features recited in Claim 46.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 46 is submitted to be patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Acres '981.

Claim 47 depends from independent Claim 46. When the recitations of Claim 47 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 46, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 47 likewise is patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Acres '981.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 2-13, 30-33, 40, and 47 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 18-24 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,347,996 to Gilmore, et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Gilmore") is respectfully traversed.

Gauselmann and Vancura are described above. Gilmore describes a random bonus feature that occurs during play of a base game. During the random bonus feature, three symbols (30, 32, 34) are displayed to a player, and the player is prompted to select one of the symbols (30, 32, 34). An animation is displayed to the player, wherein the selected symbol (30, 32, 34) is visually dissolved to reveal a bonus.

No combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Gilmore describes nor suggests a method for an operator of networked gaming machines to remotely configure a bonus game, as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Gilmore describes nor suggests a method including receiving, from a location remote from networked gaming machines, a selection from an operator of the networked gaming machines at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria displayed in a list to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of a base game and the bonus game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game and is specific to a particular player playing the base game. Further, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Gilmore describes nor suggests detecting a selected triggering criterion, receiving player data, wherein player data includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining one or more of the selected triggering criterion that correspond to the player data, and triggering an operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more of the selected triggering criterion corresponds to.

Rather, MPEP 2141.02 VI requires that prior art references must be considered in their entirety. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). In the present rejection, it is evident that

the Office is improperly picking and choosing various elements of the prior art in hindsight, and ignoring to how the elements in the prior art would interact if combined.

For example, while the Office relies on Gauselmann as allegedly describing that all the initial settings may, instead, be directly defined via an operator's console without the operator being physically present at any EGM. The Office acknowledges that Gauselmann does not describe nor suggest a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player. As such, the Office provides an additional reference, Vancura, that requires *a player* (not an operator) to choose aspects of a bonus game *at the gaming machine*, prior to starting play of a base game, which is the exact opposite of what the Office is relying on Gauselmann for (e.g., an operator, not a player, defining bonus settings remote from the gaming device). Therefore, Vancura actually teaches away from defining initial settings via an operator's console without an operator being physically present at any EGM. Thus, as the Court indicated in *U.S. v. Adams*, "[i]f art 'teaches away' from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the non-obviousness of the invention." U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Further, even if Vancura described a bonus game triggering criteria, which corresponds to player data associated with the player, the combination of Gauselmann and Vancura would still fail to describe or suggest receiving, from a location remote from networked gaming machines, a selection from an operator of the networked gaming machines at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria displayed in a list to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of a base game and the bonus game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game and is specific to a particular player playing the base game.

In addition, Gilmore describes an animation that is displayed to a player to reveal a bonus in response to selection of a symbol. As such, Gilmore does not remedy the deficiencies of Gauselmann and Vancura in describing or rendering obvious the features recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Gilmore.

Claims 18-24 and 28 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 18-24 and 28 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 18-24 and 28 likewise are patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Gilmore.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 18-24 and 28 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,231,445 to Acres (hereinafter referred to as "Acres '445") is respectfully traversed.

Gauselmann and Vancura are described above. Acres '445 describes a method for awarding a bonus award to a gaming machine (10) that is connected to a bonusing computer (38) via a network. During play of a base game when no bonus period is active, a player operates the gaming machine (10) normally by activating a spin button (14) to spin a plurality of reels to present a randomly determined combination of symbols. When a bonus period is active, the bonusing computer (38) determines an initial bonus amount and a bonus triggering event. First, the bonusing computer (38) determines the bonus triggering event by determining a Pay Line that is required to win the bonus. Second, the bonusing computer (38) determines the initial bonus amount. As the bonus period progresses, the bonusing computer (38) decrements the initial bonus amount. If the gaming machine (10) presents the Pay Line that is associated with the bonus triggering event, the player is awarded with the decremented bonus amount.

No combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '445 describes nor suggests a method for an operator of networked gaming machines to remotely configure a bonus game, as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '445 describes nor suggests a method including receiving, from a location remote from

36

networked gaming machines, a selection from an operator of the networked gaming machines at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria displayed in a list to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of a base game and the bonus game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game and is specific to a particular player playing the base game. Further, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Acres '445 describes nor suggests detecting a selected triggering criterion, receiving player data, wherein player data includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining one or more of the selected triggering criterion that correspond to the player data, and triggering an operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more of the selected triggering criterion corresponds to.

In addition, Acres '445 describes decrementing an initial bonus amount as a bonus period progresses. As such, Acres '445 does not remedy the deficiencies of Gauselmann and Vancura in describing or rendering obvious the features recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Acres '445.

Claim 25 depends from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claim 25 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 25 likewise is patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Acres '445.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 25 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,656,046 to Yoseloff, et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Yoseloff") is respectfully traversed.

Gauselmann and Vancura are described above. Yoseloff describes a method of playing a video wagering game on a reel slot machine. The game includes two or more

distinct segments with different video formats and played in sequence. At least a portion of any awards or winnings obtained during a first segment may be, or must be, carried forward as a wager in a second segment.

No combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Yoseloff describes nor suggests a method for an operator of networked gaming machines to remotely configure a bonus game, as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Yoseloff describes nor suggests a method including receiving, from a location remote from networked gaming machines, a selection from an operator of the networked gaming machines at least one of a plurality of possible bonus game triggering criteria displayed in a list to thereby define a bonus game triggering criterion related to at least one of a base game and the bonus game, wherein the selected triggering criterion is based at least partially on multiple selected outcomes of the base game and is specific to a particular player playing the base game. Further, no combination of Gauselmann, Vancura, and Yoseloff describes nor suggests detecting a selected triggering criterion, receiving player data, wherein player data includes at least player demographic data and monitored player activity, determining one or more of the selected triggering criterion that correspond to the player data, and triggering an operation of a bonus game on a gaming machine being played by a player associated with the player data and to which the determined one or more of the selected triggering criterion corresponds to.

In addition, Yoseloff describes a game that includes two distinct segments, wherein at least a portion of any awards or winnings obtained during a first segment may be, or must be, carried forward as a wager in a second segment. As such, Yoseloff does not remedy the deficiencies of Gauselmann and Vancura in describing or rendering obvious the features recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Yoseloff.

Claims 26 and 27 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 26 and 27 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit

that dependent Claims 26 and 27 likewise are patentable over Gauselmann in view of Vancura and Yoseloff.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 26 and 27 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin K. Jones/

Kevin K. Jones
Registration No. 56,809
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
7700 Forsyth Blvd., Suite 1800
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
(314) 621-5070